

The complaint

Mrs S complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) failed to refund money that Mrs S lost as part of a scam.

What happened

Mrs S was contacted by a person who said that she could earn money by working for a company that I will call B. Mrs S was told that she would need to complete sets of online tasks and that she would be paid for this. But once she started, she was told that she had to pay fees to unlock further tasks and release her earnings.

From her Revolut account, Mrs S made around 10 payments totalling over £75,000 to a crypto exchange account. The funds were exchanged into crypto and then were sent on to B. These transactions took place in May 2025.

Mrs S was told she had to pay a series of fees to get her earnings and at this point she realised that she had been scammed.

She raised a complaint with Revolut as she thought that it should have prevented her from sending the funds to the scammer. She requested that Revolut refund the transactions in question.

One of our investigators looked into this matter and they did not uphold this complaint.

Mrs S did not agree with this and therefore her complaint was passed to me to issue a final decision.

What I’ve decided – and why

I’ve considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what’s fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

In this decision, I’ll concentrate my comments on what I think is relevant. If I don’t comment on a specific point, it’s not because I’ve failed to consider it, but because I don’t think I need to comment in order to reach a fair and reasonable outcome. Our rules allow me to do this and this reflects the nature of our service as a free and informal alternative to the courts.

In broad terms, the starting position is banks are expected to process payments and withdrawals that a customer authorises it to make, in accordance with the Payment Services Regulations and the terms and conditions of the customer’s account.

But, taking into account relevant law, regulators’ rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time, I consider it fair and reasonable that Revolut should:

- have been monitoring accounts and any payments made or received to counter various risks, including preventing fraud and scams;

- have had systems in place to look out for unusual transactions or other signs that might indicate that its customers were at risk of fraud (among other things). This is particularly so, given the increase in sophisticated fraud and scams in recent years, which firms are generally more familiar with than the average customer;
- in some circumstances, irrespective of the payment channel used, have taken additional steps, or made additional checks, or provided additional warnings, before processing a payment – (as in practice Revolut sometimes does including in relation to card payments);
- have been mindful of – among other things – common scam scenarios, how the fraudulent practices are evolving (including for example the common use of multistage fraud by scammers, including the use of payments to cryptocurrency accounts as a step to defraud consumers) and the different risks these can present to consumers, when deciding whether to intervene.

I can see that Revolut did intervene when Mrs S made the first transfer. I think that a proportionate intervention would have been to ask questions about the payments and provide a warning based on the answers provided. When Revolut intervened, it asked questions about the payment. However, Mrs S did not provide accurate information about the circumstances surrounding the payment. She said to Revolut that she was investing in crypto and was not sending funds from the crypto account to a different account and there was no third-party involvement. This prevented Revolut from giving a warning that related to the exact scam that she was the victim of.

Given this, I think it more likely than not that if Revolut had questioned Mrs S even further about the payments, she would have likely provided answers designed to allow the payments to go through. Also, I think that this would have prevented Revolut from providing a warning that would have been relevant to the scam that Mrs S was falling for.

I think that Revolut should have intervened again later in the scam. But I don't think the scam would have been stopped if this had happened. I say this because Revolut was only required to take proportionate steps to try and protect Mrs S from financial harm. Given that Mrs S was providing answers that were plausible but not accurate, Revolut could not, in my view, have uncovered the scam regardless of its level of intervention.

So overall, I think that Revolut should have intervened more than it did. But I do not think that this would have likely stopped or uncovered the scam.

I note Mrs S's comments that she was vulnerable at the time. But I don't think, from what Mrs S shared with Revolut at the time of the scam, that it should have had cause to be concerned about Mrs S's ability to manage her finances or that she was more likely to be scammed. I also note that during the call with Revolut she did not mention that she needed any additional help and indicated that her medical treatment had finished which would suggest that there was no need of ongoing concerns from Revolut.

I've also thought about whether Revolut did enough to attempt to recover the money Mrs S lost. In this instance, the APP reimbursement scheme does not apply as the payments were made to an account in her own name. Also, there does not seem to be any prospect of recovering the funds from the account the funds were sent to, as they had already been sent on to B as a crypto currency.

I appreciate this will come as a disappointment to Mrs S, and I'm sorry to hear she has been the victim of a scam. However, I'm not persuaded that Revolut can fairly or reasonably be held liable for her loss in these circumstances.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs S to accept or reject my decision before 25 February 2026.

Charlie Newton
Ombudsman